JISMUN'25

LEGAL: BANNING THE USE OF AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS IN WARDFARE

Study Guide

Table Of Content

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to JISMUN 2025, Aljazari's first-ever MUN conference!

As your (very sleep deprived but incredibly excited) Secretary General, I'm proud to welcome you to something we built from scratch, with a lot of passion and probably too much caffeine.

Whether you're an experienced delegate or nervously holding your placard, this is your moment. Speak boldly, debate fiercely, and most importantly: have fun.

Let's make history.

With love and under-eye bags,

Salsabeel Hassan
Secretary-General

JISMUN 2025

Esteemed Delegates,

It is with great pleasure that I welcome you to the LEGAL committee of JISMUN'25 . My name is Mihçen Özçelik, and I am honored to serve as the Under-Secretary-General (USG) responsible for this committee. Throughout this journey, it will be my utmost priority to ensure a constructive, intellectually stimulating, and inclusive experience for each of you.

The agenda item we will be tackling is "The Legal Implications of Autonomous Weapons" stands at the intersection of emerging technology, humanitarian law, and international security. As future diplomats, legal scholars, and leaders, your ability to engage with this topic critically and ethically is vital. From questions of accountability and compliance with International Humanitarian Law (IHL), to the definition and classification of autonomy in warfare, this agenda demands careful consideration and spirited debate.

This committee offers you a unique opportunity to explore the frameworks of international law in a fast-changing world. I encourage you to not only master the background of the topic, but to also consider the moral, ethical, and geopolitical dimensions of autonomous weapons systems.

Throughout the conference, the Dais Team and I will be here to support you with anything you may need. I trust that each of you will bring your best self to the table, and I look forward to seeing the innovative and impactful solutions you propose.

In case you have any questions regarding research, procedure, or logistics, do not hesitate to reach out. Until then, I wish you the best of luck with your preparations. Let this experience be one of learning, growth, and diplomacy.

Warm regards,

Mihçen Özçelik

Under-Secretary-General

1. Introduction to The Agenda Item

1.1 Overview of Autonomous Weapons

The rapid growth of artificial intelligence and robotics is really changing the game when it comes to military tech. We're talking about a whole new era here, especially with the rise of autonomous weapons systems, or AWS for short. These systems can choose and engage targets all on their own, without needing a human to pull the trigger, so to speak. That's a huge shift in how wars might be fought down the line. There's this report from the CNAS called "Autonomous Weapons and Operational Risk" by Paul Scharre that dives deep into the risks, operational challenges, and strategic impacts of these technologies. In this piece, we'll take a closer look at what the report says about autonomous weapons, the ethical and operational risks they bring, and why it's so important to keep meaningful human control in military decisions.

You know, autonomous weapons aren't just fancy gadgets for soldiers, they're like independent agents making decisions that could mean life or death. Unlike drones that are controlled remotely or guided missiles, these weapons can go about their business once activated, using algorithms to analyze sensor data, identify targets, and decide if an attack should happen. This kind of independence is a real game changer compared to traditional weapons, bringing in a whole new level of unpredictability that comes with letting machines make decisions.

The report points out that autonomy isn't just black and white; it exists on a spectrum. Some systems are semi-autonomous, meaning they still need a human to weigh in at key moments, while others can carry out missions entirely on their own. This distinction is super important because it raises a big question, should we ever let machines make life-and-death decisions without any human oversight?

At the heart of this debate is the shift of decision-making power from humans to machines. It brings up some pretty fundamental questions: Can machines really grasp the complex nature of human conflict? Are they capable of moral reasoning? Can they make judgments based on context and intent? These aren't just academic musings, they're pressing questions, especially considering where military technology seems to be headed.

1.2 The current usage of Autonomous Weapons in warzone

Autonomous weapon systems, or AWS for short, are like the cool new gadgets of the military world. They're all about using the latest tech to handle military stuff with barely any humans needing to get directly involved. These bad boys are powered by AI, robotics, and some fancy sensor tech, and they can do all sorts of things like keep an eye on things, figure out what's a threat, and even take it out if it needs to be. This is a big deal because it's changing the way wars are fought and making people think hard about what's right and wrong with letting machines make life-and-death decisions.

One of the cooler examples of these systems is the Sea Hunter, which the U.S. Navy's been playing with. It's basically a boat that can drive itself, hunt down enemy subs, and keep tabs on them without someone having to sit there and control it every second. It's like a robotic submarine chaser that can hang out in the ocean for ages without needing a break. It's pretty handy for keeping an eye on things and staying safe without risking human lives.

Then there's the Harop, which the Israel Defense Forces are into. This little drone is like a real-life video game—it floats around looking for bad guys and when it sees one, boom, it takes itself out to take them out. It's like a super smart missile that can decide what to blow up on the spot. This is a big deal because it means drones could start making their own decisions on the battlefield, which is pretty intense.

On land, the Russians have something called the IRBIS. It's like a robot soldier that can spot and attack targets without needing a human to tell it what to do. It's got all these sensors that help it find its way and pick out who's who in a fight, which is super helpful when you don't want to send real people into dangerous places.

But it's not just the U.S. and Russia playing with these toys. China, South Korea, and the UK are all getting in on the action with their own versions for land, sea, air, and even cyberspace. It's like everyone's trying to get the best tech to have the upper hand in war.

The thing is, while these robot soldiers might save some human lives, they also bring up some serious ethical questions. What happens when a robot makes a mistake? Who's to blame when a machine kills someone? And what's to stop a robot war from getting out of control? These are the kind of things that keep people up at night.

So, while autonomous weapons are already here and changing the face of war, we've got to be careful. We need some serious rules and agreements between countries to make sure we don't end up in a sci-fi nightmare. The goal is to use this tech to make things better and safer, not to create a world where machines are fighting each other with no one to stop them. It's a tough balance, but it's important to get it right.

2. Ethical Considerations

The ethical implications surrounding autonomous weapon systems are significant and complex. One of the main concerns is the delegation of life and death decisions to machines. As these

systems can operate autonomously, the potential for error or failure raises questions about accountability in warfare.

Moreover, the use of autonomous weapon systems could lead to the dehumanization of a conflict in which the experience of war becomes further removed from human control. This shift could lead not only to increased casualties but also to a reduced sense of responsibility among military operators and commanders. Problems of compliance with international humanitarian law also arise. Autonomous systems must adhere to principles such as distinction and proportionality and be able to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants. But programming machines to correctly interpret these nuances is a challenging task.

Public acceptance of autonomous weapon systems is further complicated by ethical debates that often emphasize the unpredictability of machine decision-making. The implications of a future in which warfare becomes increasingly automated require a rigorous examination of moral standards and legality in war scenarios.

2.1 Accountability and Responsibility in Warfare

The thing is, these systems can't do the human stuff like knowing the difference between a combatant and a regular person, or feeling bad when they mess up. They just don't get the whole "do unto others" vibe. And when they do goof up and make a big mistake, like hitting a school instead of a military base, who do you blame? The person who wrote the code, the boss who gave the order, or the company that built the thing? It's a tough call because everyone's a bit detached from the actual pushing of the button.

Some folks argue that these robotic soldiers could make war safer and less messy because they don't get stressed out or make dumb mistakes like humans. But let's be real, machines are cold and calculating. They don't have hearts or feelings, so they can't grasp the seriousness of what they're doing. It's like asking a toaster to decide if you should have a good or a bad day—it just doesn't get it.

That's why a bunch of smart people and organizations that care about human rights think we need some serious global rules for these weapons. We can't have robots running around killing people without someone to blame, right? And we definitely don't want war to become a numbers game. Keeping the moral compass in human hands, with all our messy emotions and sense of justice, is the only way to make sure we're fighting fair. It's all about keeping that human touch, you know? So we don't forget that every life matters, even when we're in the heat of battle.

3.Autonomous Weapons in International Law

The legal implications of autonomous weapon systems (AWS) under international law. It analyzes how AWS intersects with various legal frameworks, including the law governing the use of force (jus ad bellum), international humanitarian law (IHL), and international human rights law. The briefing emphasizes that AWS must adhere to IHL principles such as distinction, proportionality, and precautions in attack. A significant concern is whether AWS can reliably distinguish between combatants and civilians, assess proportionality, and take necessary precautions to minimize harm to civilians. The briefing also highlights the obligation of states to conduct legal reviews of new weapons to ensure compliance with international law.

Accountability is another critical issue addressed in the briefing. It questions who would be held responsible if AWS committed an unlawful act,be it the programmer, manufacturer, or military commander. The complexity of assigning responsibility in the context of AWS challenges existing legal frameworks. The briefing suggests that maintaining meaningful human control over AWS is essential to ensure accountability and compliance with international law. It calls for international discussions to establish clear norms and regulations governing the development and use of AWS to uphold legal and ethical standards in armed conflict.

3.1 Existing Legal Frameworks and Gaps

Autonomous weapon systems (AWS) fall under several established international legal frameworks, notably international humanitarian law (IHL), international human rights law (IHRL), and the law regulating the use of force. These bodies of law place important responsibilities on states and military personnel, particularly the obligation to uphold key principles such as distinction, differentiating between combatants and civilians, proportionality, ensuring military gains are not outweighed by harm to civilians, and precaution in planning and conducting attacks. While these legal standards are designed to guide the conduct of war, their application becomes increasingly complex when decisions are delegated to machines rather than humans.States are also required to conduct legal reviews of all new weapons under Article 36 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions to ensure their compliance with international law. These frameworks theoretically apply to AWS, but their application becomes complex when machines make independent decisions, raising questions about whether AWS can reliably fulfill legal criteria intended for human judgment.

Despite these existing laws, significant legal gaps remain. The most pressing issue is accountability: when an autonomous weapon commits an unlawful act, it is unclear who should be held responsible, programmers, manufacturers, commanders, or states. Traditional laws assume a human decision-maker, but AWS may act without direct human input, creating a “responsibility gap.” Additionally, there is no dedicated international treaty specifically addressing AWS, leading to ambiguity in regulation, oversight, and enforcement. The lack of consensus on defining and classifying AWS further complicates efforts to regulate them. As a

result, the Geneva Academy and many legal scholars advocate for new international norms or instruments that explicitly address the unique risks posed by autonomous weapons and ensure compliance with humanitarian and human rights standards.

3.2 Proposals for New International Regulations

The immediate priority should be to bring the experts group's work to a successful conclusion. The group must recommend the initiation of negotiations for a legally binding instrument based on the two-tier approach, encompassing prohibitions and regulations for autonomous weapons systems. Although it does not tackle concerns regarding antipersonnel systems effectively, the group chair's rolling text of November 2024 shows that many states are close to agreeing on the key rules needed to preserve human control.

The Sea Hunter, a prototype submarine-hunting drone ship that can cross the open seas without a human crew for months at a time, is among the autonomous weapons systems being tested by the U.S. Navy.

The group mandate extends to 2026, with the CCW review conference set as the deadline for a final report, but progress should be accelerated to conclude by the end of 2025. Substantive recommendations on prohibitions and regulations are on the table. Continuing discussions ad infinitum without committing to action would represent a failure of political responsibility, especially for states that claim to uphold international humanitarian law and universal values.

In parallel, efforts to generate political momentum for regulating these systems must intensify. Participation in the experts group remains limited. Many countries of the Global South are notably absent, despite the inevitable future global impact of these systems once they become cheap and accessible. Moreover, despite active civil society participation and input, the group's work receives very limited public attention, and there is little critical focus on those blocking progress.

4. Technological Aspects of Autonomous Weapons

Technologically, AWS integrates complex subsystems such as target recognition, navigation, threat assessment, and mission execution—all of which require robust and adaptive AI models to function effectively in dynamic environments. However, this autonomy also introduces major challenges regarding predictability and reliability, especially when systems are deployed in unpredictable or adversarial scenarios.One of the most pressing concerns is the "black box" nature of AI used in these weapons. Machine learning models, particularly deep neural networks, often lack transparency in how decisions are made, making it difficult to audit or understand the rationale behind a system's actions. Furthermore, these models are vulnerable to adversarial attacks, where manipulated inputs can lead to dangerous misclassifications or system failure. Other technical risks include reward hacking—where an AI may exploit its programming to achieve objectives in unintended ways—and goal misgeneralization, where it pursues the wrong outcomes due to flawed training data or operational assumptions.

To address these risks, researchers are developing more advanced AI approaches, including reinforcement learning with human feedback, explainable artificial intelligence (XAI), and hybrid human-machine team models. Reinforcement learning allows systems to improve over time based on trial-and-error interactions with their environments, while human feedback helps guide the learning process toward ethically acceptable outcomes. Explainable AI aims to make ML models' decision-making processes more transparent and provide human operators with insights into why a particular decision was made. As militaries increasingly explore how to integrate autonomous systems into their strategic operations, these innovations are essential to building trust in AWS and ensuring compliance with ethical norms and international law.

5. Humanitarian Implications

Strict regulation is needed to ensure that systems developed over the next few decades can truly protect civilians and other non-combatants (Boulanin, Bruun, and Goussac 2021).

Adequate human control over weapon systems must be mandated. Any weapon system that relies on sensor input to make decisions about target selection and engagement should be considered high risk and unacceptable. There currently seems to be a broad consensus among governments that autonomous functions should not be used in weapons that are currently banned.

Weapon platforms that can most easily penetrate civilian areas are those that need the most strict regulation. These include autonomous aircraft (UAVs), loitering munitions, and tanks. The greatest concern is whether such systems are capable of autonomously sc

5.1 Challenging International Humanitarian Law

Autonomous weapons systems (AWS) pose a serious challenge to the humanitarian principles at the core of the law of war. One of the most fundamental principles, the “principle of distinction”, that is, the clear distinction between civilians and combatants, cannot be fully achieved with the current technological level of AWS. The possibility of errors in target detection by these systems can lead to increased civilian casualties on the battlefield. The management of decision-making processes by artificial intelligence replaces human judgment and at tanning an area, but rather of selecting or engaging targets.

Exports of technologies and systems to countries where they may be used for purposes not intended by the exporters should be restricted and, in some cases, monitored. Monitoring is particularly important due to the multipurpose nature of much of the technology that will be incorporated into autonomous weapon systems.
he same time blurs ethical responsibility.

The principle of distinction requires parties to a conflict to always differentiate between civilians and combatants. However, with AWS, this principle may be compromised due to potential inaccuracies in target identification. As a result, there is a risk of indiscriminate attacks and harm to innocent civilians.

Proportionality is another fundamental principle that may be at risk with AWS. This principle mandates that any attack must not cause excessive harm to civilians compared to the anticipated military advantage gained. Unfortunately, autonomous systems lack the ability to fully comprehend and evaluate the human aspects of every situation, leading to potential violations of this principle. The use of AWS also raises concerns about responsibility and accountability. In cases where an autonomous system makes a wrong decision resulting in civilian casualties, it becomes unclear who should be held responsible. This ambiguity poses a significant challenge to the principle of individual responsibility that underpins the law of war.

Given these challenges, it is crucial to reevaluate the basic principles of international humanitarian law in light of the development and deployment of AWS. Updating legal frameworks to align with new technologies is essential for both civilian protection and the long-term viability of the law of war.Establishing effective regulations regarding AWS is not only a military obligation but also a humanitarian responsibility. It requires collaboration between legal experts, military authorities, and humanitarian organizations to ensure that emerging technologies are used in ways that uphold humanitarian principles.

In conclusion, while AWS may offer certain advantages on the battlefield, their implications for humanitarian principles cannot be overlooked. It is imperative that we critically examine these technologies and their potential impact on warfare in order to safeguard the rights and dignity of all individuals affected by armed conflict.

6. Societal and Economic Impacts of Autonomous Weapons

6.1 Impact on Military Labor and Employment Structures

The integration of autonomous weapons into military operations is not just a technical shift it's a structural transformation in how armed forces function. As machines begin to take on tasks once handled by soldiers, such as reconnaissance, patrolling, or threat response, the traditional concept of a soldier is being redefined. These systems demand fewer boots on the ground and more minds behind the screen software engineers, data analysts, and AI technicians are quickly becoming indispensable in modern defense units. While this change can lead to greater efficiency and safety on the battlefield, it also disrupts conventional military labor systems.

This transition brings with it a number of socioeconomic challenges. For instance, countries with strong military traditions but limited technological infrastructure may struggle to retrain their personnel or update their institutions. There's also a risk of deepening inequality within the armed forces themselves, as access to technical training and digital literacy becomes a gatekeeper to advancement. In many ways, autonomous weapons aren't just reshaping how wars are fought they're reshaping who fights them, and what it means to serve

6.2 Privatization and the Role of Defense Companies in AWS Development

Autonomous weapons are no longer developed solely behind closed military doors. Today, some of the most powerful and sophisticated AWS technologies are being designed by private

companies tech startups, AI labs, and global defense contractors. While these actors bring innovation and speed, their growing influence raises some uncomfortable questions. When profit and competition enter the equation, ethical considerations can easily take a back seat. Unlike state institutions, private firms aren't always bound by the same legal or moral obligations, especially when operating across international borders or in conflict zones with weak regulation.

Another complication lies in transparency. Many of these technologies are protected under intellectual property laws, meaning even government officials or international watchdogs may not have full access to the inner workings of a system. This makes accountability in case of malfunction or misuse far more difficult to enforce. As the line between public defense and private enterprise blurs, there is an urgent need for better regulation not just of the machines themselves, but of the entire ecosystem that produces them.

6.3 Public Opinion and Media Narratives Surrounding AWS

How autonomous weapons are understood by the public can significantly shape their future. While most people have never seen such a system in real life, popular culture has already filled in the blanks with killer robots, rogue AI, and moral ambiguity dominating the narrative. These images, while exaggerated, reflect a deeper discomfort: the idea of machines making life-and-death decisions. As a result, even countries heavily invested in AWS research often face public skepticism, if not outright opposition.

But media influence isn't just about fear it can also drive awareness and activism. Civil society campaigns like "Stop Killer Robots" have turned technical debates into mainstream political issues, influencing lawmakers and international discussions alike. In democratic settings, voter concerns can lead to budget cuts or stricter oversight on military R&D. Even in more closed political systems, public and academic discourse can pressure leaders to tread carefully. Ultimately, autonomous weapons are as much a societal question as they are a military one and ignoring public sentiment could have serious political consequences.

7. Proposals for Banning the Use of Autonomous Weapons

7.1 Strategies for a Comprehensive Ban

In recent years, the proposal for a global ban on autonomous weapon systems (AWS) has gained increasing significance due to ethical, humanitarian, and legal concerns. However, the implementation of such a ban presents several challenges. The first and most significant challenge is defining what exactly constitutes an "autonomous weapon." There is still ambiguity in this area. Clarity, especially around concepts like "meaningful human control," is essential. This definition is crucial in determining when a system should be classified as fully autonomous rather than semi-autonomous or remotely controlled by a human operator.

Another significant challenge is the need for international cooperation to ensure such a ban is accepted globally. Countries have varying political, military, and technological interests, and reconciling these differences will be key. Some nations may argue that banning AWS would undermine their national security or reduce their military capabilities, while others may view these systems as a strategic advantage. At this point, discussions are needed not only on the ethical and humanitarian imperatives of a ban but also on how to balance these with national security concerns.

A total ban may be difficult to achieve immediately, but a step-by-step approach could be more feasible. One potential strategy is the implementation of a temporary moratorium on the development and deployment of AWS, giving countries time to assess the full risks associated with these systems. This pause would provide an opportunity for more in-depth international discussions and a deeper understanding of the technological implications. Following this moratorium, discussions could move towards a more comprehensive ban, paving the way for stronger legal frameworks and diplomatic agreements. For this approach to succeed, strong leadership from governments and international organizations is necessary. Collaborative efforts from governments, academic institutions, and civil society organizations will be key in ensuring the success of this initiative.

7.2 Role of International Organizations and Cooperation

International organizations play a critical role in addressing the issue of autonomous weapons systems and are key to the success of any proposed ban. The United Nations (UN), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) are all vital in laying the groundwork for legal frameworks, facilitating international dialogue, and ensuring compliance with international norms. These organizations offer platforms for discussion and are critical for ensuring that any agreements made are enforceable.

The UN, in particular, has the potential to take on a central role in managing these discussions and shaping global standards for autonomous weapons. Additionally, regional defense alliances such as NATO, the African Union, or ASEAN could play a significant role in crafting region-specific solutions to AWS, which could then contribute to a broader international treaty. Such regional agreements would allow countries with distinct military and political concerns to negotiate solutions that suit their unique security needs, thus gradually building towards a global consensus.

Moreover, non-state actors, such as civil society organizations, academic institutions, and independent research centers, are crucial in contributing independent perspectives to the debate. These actors provide objective research, raise public awareness, and hold governments accountable for their actions. Their involvement ensures that discussions on AWS are not solely driven by military interests but are balanced with humanitarian and ethical considerations.

Additionally, for any global agreement to ban AWS to be successful, there must be mechanisms in place to monitor compliance and prevent violations. This is where the experience of organizations such as the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in monitoring disarmament agreements becomes invaluable. These agencies could play a critical role in overseeing the adherence to any treaty banning autonomous weapons. Monitoring processes such as regular inspections and transparent reporting are essential to ensuring that countries do not secretly develop or deploy AWS in violation of international standards. Moreover, building trust through transparency and cooperation will be crucial in maintaining the long-term effectiveness of any such agreement.

8. Outstanding Countries

8.1 European View

The European Union (EU) encompasses a wide variety of opinions in its attempt to design a common policy on autonomous weapon systems (AWS). Meanwhile, member states are engaging in various ethical, legal, and security-oriented discussions concerning their use. In a 2018 decision, the European Parliament declared that "lethal autonomous weapon systems" should be banned outright and emphasized that human control should always be retained. However, no agreement has been reached among member states on the matter. Whereas some nations believe these technologies might enhance their defensive capacities, others fear the systems may grossly violate humanitarian and international law as a result of making decisions without human intervention. For these reasons, a given sustainable and legally binding framework has yet to emerge within the EU for the development, use, or regulation of such systems.

8.2 United States of America

The U.S. has been a world leader in the research, development, and operational employment in the field of autonomous weapons systems. The Department of Defense has been heavily investing in the incorporation of artificial intelligence technologies into already existing weapons systems and considers having superiority in this area a critical strategical priority. While the US is emphasizing the principle of "meaningful human control," a clearly defined international framework for its implementation should be established. Furthermore, the United States is not in favor of any international accord that would put a complete ban on autonomous weapon systems. It asserts that national legislation would contradict attempts to regulate such advanced weaponry, as they could act as a fetter on innovation. Instead, they advocate that states should exercise responsible behavior as per their national laws. Such a position of the United States shows its intention of guarding both national security interests and leading in its technological advancements as well.

8.3 Türkiye

In the last few decades, Turkey has become one of the notable countries in developing drone and semi-autonomous systems because of its recent investments in the defense industry. With UAV projects like Bayraktar TB2, Akıncı, and Kızılelma, Turkey has made a name for itself on an international scale and is now working on integrating attributes into those technologies, such as AI-based target recognition and attack capacity. Turkey sees autonomous systems as means to increase its military deterrence, while affording itself a way to counter effectively asymmetric threats. Turkish officials have indicated that they are open to global ethical discussions concerning fully autonomous weapons that exclude human control, however, their position is that these technologies must be regulated along the lines of transparency and responsible use rather than being banned altogether. This approach taken by Turkey would be consistent with its goal of promoting technological advancement while protecting its national security interests.

8.4 Germany

Germany is one of the European countries which has strictly opposed autonomous weapons systems. The federal government deems the capacity of lethal autonomous systems to identify and engage targets without human intervention as completely incompatible with the fundamental principles of international humanitarian law. In this context, Germany maintains that "systems that displace human judgment" are morally unacceptable and has insisted on a binding international agreement in the UN-sponsored negotiations. The country favors the development of systems that are purely defensive in nature, with a very limited degree of autonomy, and stresses that the use of lethal force against a target in the absence of human control has to be outlawed. This position reflects Germany's historical sense of responsibility and adherence to international legal norms.

8.5 Australia

In Austria, there is no doubt on the part of the various vocations of the country with regard to endless denunciations against autonomous weapons systems. This country insists upon a rather conclusive prohibition on the development and use of fully autonomous weapons because they, according to the country, will threaten human dignity and undermine accountability in conflicts.
This is entirely unacceptable according to the Austrian Foreign Ministry because these technologies shift war decisions to machines and thereby bring in great risks under international law. Since 2013, Austria has been actively calling for a complete ban within the framework of the UN Conference on Disarmament and Signature by CCW (Certain Conventional Weapons), while also working to create an international norm in this field. It has tradition as regards disarmament, peace, and human rights, and it could be seen from this standpoint.

9. Bibliography

Autonomous Weapons Operational Risk." *Center for a New American Security* , September 2021,,

Autonomous Weapon Systems." *Total Military Insight*, 2021,

Crootof, Rebecca. "Crimes of Dispassion: Autonomous Weapons and the Moral Challenge of Systematic Killing." *Ethics & International Affairs*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2019, pp. 21-35. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/S0892679419000027.

Autonomous Weapon Systems: Legality Under International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights." *Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights*, 2021,

"Autonomous Weapons and the Cardinal Principles of IHL." *DLP Forum* , 18 Oct. 2021,

"Autonomous Weapons: The False Promise of Civilian Protection." *Centre for International Governance Innovation*, 10 Mar. 2021,

Docherty, Bonnie. *Losing Humanity: The Case Against Killer Robots.* Human Rights Watch, 2012.

Boulanin, Vincent & Verbruggen, Maaike. *Mapping the Development of Autonomy in Weapon Systems.* SIPRI, 2017.

Sharkey, Noel. “The Evitability of Autonomous Robot Warfare.” *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 94, no. 886, 2012.

Scharre, Paul. *Army of None: Autonomous Weapons and the Future of War.* W. W. Norton & Company, 2018.

10. Further Reading

Future of Life Institute: Resources on lethal autonomous weapons

ICRC Reports on International Humanitarian Law and AWS

IEEE: Ethical Design in Autonomous Systems

UNIDIR: The Weaponization of Increasingly Autonomous Technologies

PAX Report: "Slippery Slope: The Growing Threat of Killer Robots"

Oxford Handbook of Law and Autonomous Systems (selected chapters)

AI Now Institute Annual Report (for civilian AI governance parallels)

11. Questions To Be Answered

1.How should “autonomous weapons systems” be defined in international law?

2.To what extent should human control remain central in lethal decision-making?

3.What are the ethical boundaries of delegating lethal force to machines?

4.How can legal accountability be established when no direct human action is involved?

5.Are existing humanitarian laws sufficient to regulate AWS? If not, what are the key gaps?

6.How could autonomous weapons affect the principle of proportionality and distinction in warfare?

7.What would a successful international ban on AWS look like?

8.What roles should private defense companies and AI developers play in the regulation of AWS?

9.How can the global community ensure transparency and compliance among major military powers?

What socio-economic consequences might arise from increased military automation?